

DRAFT NOTES:
Water Management Coordinating Team Meeting – 9/30/99
9:30-2:30

Attendees:

Bruce Herbold, Dave Fullerton, BJ Miller, Pete Chadwick, Elise Holland, Mike Fris, Curtis Creel, Lowell Ploss, Greg Gartrell, Tom Boardman, Tom Cannon, Mark Cowin, Ron Ott, Dale Flowers, Spreck Rosekrans, Dave Schuster, Jim White, Karl Halupka, Gary Stern, Dick Daniel, Jim Snow, Larry Smith, Bill Johnston.

AGENDA:

- **Assets**
 - preliminary screening
 - additional assets
 - Ops Group Paper
 - Consolidated list
- **Early Stage 1 discussion**
- **Late Stage 1 discussion**
- **Assignments**
- **Schedule presentations to DT**
- **Informational items**

Early Stage 1 List

- Elise went through list of actions for Early Stage 1
- Tom Clark suggested a more limited Kern Water Bank
- Moved Arvid-Edison down list
- Shasta boards added

Late Stage 1 List

- Elise presented late Stage 1 list.
- Shasta Dam greater expansion than boards was added.

Potential Additional Assets for Stage 1

- Elise presented additional asset list.
- Discussion by item follows

15. GW Pumping to Surface Storage - negative yield concept because of greater reservoir spill risk. Tom Clark suggested local exchanges by pumping from GW to surface storage (transfers). Concept helps to deal with low capacity problem with GW. Causes problems in wet years by increased fill and spill - but GW also charges in wet years - cost of pumping is problem, not water loss. Focuses on East San Joaquin Valley aquifers. Normally GW pumping occurs when crops need water in summer. This concept would pump after crops need water and solely for purpose of filling reservoirs and transferring

GW storage to surface water in fall before rainy season to hedge our bets on a dry year. Use depends on carryover storage level. Part of a general operating strategy and optimization scheme.

Q: What would the water be used for Env or WS? R: Both.

C: As described the action is fine.

C: Really just an expansion of conjunctive use program. Optimize coordinated use of surface and GW.

C: General strategy rather than a specif project. A lot more needs to be done to define what the project would be.

C: East Side conjunctive use is not presently on our list.

Q: Are there multiple projects or is this just a general concept? R: It is a general strategy.

C: Need to see details to decide whether cost is worth the benefit. What are the projects? What is the overall scheme.

C: We can come up with specifics such as the intertie between Castaic and Kern Water Bank for the purpose of heading off problems with San Luis low point.

C: Bolstering San Luis in fall with GW has potential. Insurance for potential dry year.

C: An operational scheme is needed because of high cost of pumping GW.

C: Benefits likely to be small.

S: Need an Early Stage 1 concept and what can be added over time.

16. Regulatory Flexibility (changes in standards, etc) - Dan Nelson suggest more than just WQCP standards - suggested ESA take limits. Some are early stage 1 while others are more longer term. X2 standard would be later. Suisun Marsh gates standard could be early Stage 1 stand alone asset. Could change the standard that supports west Delta ag through crop changes. We could eliminate the navigation standard on the Sac River.

C: CMARP needs to examine these things - will take time.

C: We are going to be on a budget - look at the best ways to use water in any one year.

C: We should first assess the different ways we can meet the existing standards without changing them. Many have built in leeway.

C: Need a list of what we are considering.

S: Suggest change in title away from "reg flex".

C: There is no flexibility in the Suisun Marsh standards.

C: We need to break down into specifics before we rule out. Need a realistic assessment of options - problems. Need team to evaluate and present specifics.

17. Flood Control - We could modify flood control rules for reservoirs by expanding flood capacity downstream of reservoirs to provide added water supply.

C: Corps Comprehensive Study is a long-term project - at least not early Stage 1. In the same category as changes in X2.

Q: Are we looking upstream of reservoirs for more flood control? R: 5-15 TAF of yield per year may be available in the San Joaquin watershed.

Q: Is this really a Stage 1 action? R: DT wants to see options - but they want us to tell them if we think the actions are doable.

C: Stanislaus River stage changes may be doable in early Stage 1.

18. Water Acquisitions in the Delta - Concept is to acquire water in the Delta to reduce WQ impacts to Delta ag.

C: This may already be under crop shifting.

Q: Is this water releases or land fallowing? R: Put both down as potential.

C: This is a subset of our Markets list.

C: There will be a negative reaction to fallowing.

Q: Should we rule out fallowing or include? R: Political question, but we should keep on list.

C: Need to consider third-party impacts of fallowing land - other businesses suffer.

C: CALFED already dropped fallowing as an action. But as secondary action it has potential. R: Land will get fallowed - DWR has already bought a lot of Delta land - so have other non-ag users.

C: Could buy water and encourage shift to GW.

19. SWRCB Hearings - Completion of water rights hearings was suggested as an asset.

Q: How is this an asset? R: Spreading costs among users. All coordinated action agreements are potential assets.

20. SWP Contracts - Same as #5.

C: Makes more sense as CVP action - Trinity or SWP action - Monterey Agreement.

Q: Has anyone looked at the Monterey Agreement for flexibility?

C: How SWP apportions its water may be an asset. But need some fact finding.

C: Some of the assets in Monterey Agreement should have been allocated to Environment.

C: Need to look at reoperation of SWP system for potential assets.

C: We need to do a better job of explaining how these are assets.

S: We should delete SWP contracts and Monterey Agreement as assets. R: Uncomfortable with dropping these since DT suggested them. We could simple reword some of these to make them more realistic actions.

C: These actions are recognition that increases in exports will come via the SWP. There will be competition for these facilities.

C: We should focus on what is doable. Individual assets of the contracts are potentially doable.

S: We should consider EWA as a water project contract.

C: We should stay away from policy issues in the CT, although we can give some background to help the DT.

21. CVPIA - Completing the CVPIA EIR/EIS should be an asset. Other assets could include refuge water efficiency and using refuge water for environmental purposes. There are

opportunities for using refuges as temporary seasonal storage - 30% of refuge water can be reused. Many refuges with CVPIA water have yet to expand thus their water may be available in the short term. We could also increase efficiency of refuge water use (e.g., line a canal) and bank the water saved.

C: Refuge efficiency is being addressed in CVPIA.

C: BOR delivers 290 TAF but only 240 TAF is actually used - the lost 50 TAF is worth pursuing. Otherwise taking water away from refuges should not be on the list.

C: We should be watchful of indirect effects such as reduction in local GW recharge.

C: There are also other options for getting water to the refuges that would take the burden of the West Side users.

C: Something could be done in Stage 1. Water could be borrowed. Water conservation could be funded on refuges. Use refuges as storage reservoirs. Shift conveyance to refuges to free up space in project canals.

C: Need to define that Friant is not part of this.

22. Intertie: A winter limitation capacity of the DMC constrains Tracy pumping. This could be alleviated by pumping from Tracy into SWP canals using Intertie. It would gain an extra 400 cfs. This would be short term as there would be no benefit with Expanded Banks or JPOD - but we could use it early in Stage 1. Expanding the time window where pumping can be exceeded by 1/3rd of the San Joaquin flow would also eliminate the benefit of the Intertie. CVP Tracy water right is 4600 cfs - DMC limit is 4200. Intertie would come with usual caveats. Intertie would have additional benefits in terms of flexibility (e.g., reducing take by altering intake location).

C: Why not just ask Corps if you can pump the extra 400 at CCF rather than at Tracy? Would save cost of Intertie?

23. Reoperation of Reservoirs: Linked to flood control. Several features: shifting operations between GW and surface reservoirs; hydro operations; temperature requirements for carryover (for temperature control).

Q: What about the 1 maf available in Lake Almanor. R: 20-30 TAF of extra yield.

C: This is part of overall system flexibility.

C: BO for salmon should not be on table (e.g., Sac River temps)

S: Why not change the Shasta 1.9 maf carryover requirement that was instituted before temp curtain. We have had two years experience with the curtain - we should be able to assess the potential for changing the carryover requirement. R: We have had no dry years to test. Temp control device is a hydro device. We will likely get new BO's for operation. The 1.9 maf in Shasta is really a carryover for water supplies in long term drought. BO already allows relaxation of the 1.9 maf limit at Shasta in critical years. **We should keep in mix for flexibility.**

24. Rice Flooding Program: store environmental water on rice field. Use it to modify instream flows.

C: concerned about WQ effects.

C: Minimum benefits because water must be dumped by March or April to dry out fields - only helpful in dry years.

C: Concerned about effects of diverting water to fields - must be screened.

C: Feasible as an early Stage 1 option.

C: Organics from these fields would be good for estuary but not for urban water quality.

25. Draft Paper on Year 2000 Actions (GG): Actions that would not impact other water users.

- relaxation of E/I standard
- storage SOD
- additional 500 cfs at Banks
- JPOD
- SOD purchase
- purchase of Merced water after VAMP
- recirculation
- repetition of SJR flows for 2000

C: VAMP period can be adjusted already.

C: Wild salmon versus hatchery salmon conflict for VAMP.

C: Overlap salmon and smelt issues.

C: FWS is looking to expand VAMP to 60 days in AFRP. Export restrictions and flows.

Q: What is recirculation? R: keep water upstream for SD benefits.

C: VAMP is not a supply item.

C: There are differences of opinion as to what is VAMP.

C: VAMP is a tool for ops group - water acquisitions on water not needed for VAMP - can be used for WMS.

C: Recirculation should not be on list

1. Bond Act: any new assets for Stage 1 in Act? Nothing new apparent. Could be funding source for other assets.

Assignments

Assignments were made for each item on list.

S: When speaking to asset owners we should ask what it will take for owner to have an interest in developing the asset.

Asset Analysis

We are upgrading our analytical process in DNCT so we can reexamine questions that came up in gaming. We can analyze the benefits of various configurations of assets. We can vary operational rules and sharing formulas - and consequences.

Q: What were operational rules followed by DNCT in gaming? Value of past gaming is questionable because of different objectives. But there were lessons learned.

Scenario Development

Incorporate new assets and refine Stage 1 into games as a way to show DT results of assets use.

C: We need input from policy about gaming rules and baseline before we can build scenarios.

R: Scenarios should cover a range of options.

C: We should point out what we did or did not do in the games.

S: We could provide alternative scenarios for each asset.

C: We can't get too complicated.

C: We need an upgrade of the gaming process: cover various options recommended; sensitivity analysis; subcommittee work; improved gaming productivity; we made assignments to do these upgrades but we have not progressed on the work.

S: Need to game other relevant pieces - b(2), ERP flows.

C: DNCT should use their experience to come up with scenarios that will fly.

C: Our charge is to develop a framework for WMS. DT exists to make decisions and improvements.

S: Lets get scenarios out there to get DT to deal with tough issues as soon as possible.

C: Question as to how much to put in the first scenario. Get DT's input on this.

Monday Presentation and Workplan

Q: Should we focus on year 2000 package or two years down the road?

C: Get feedback on reasonableness of 2000 package.

S: On October 12th we should get feedback from DT on reasonableness of assets and get comfortable with asset set to put together a scenario. When we present concepts we want to get input that will guide us in structuring scenarios for analysis. We need a workable scenario and need their buy in.

C: Year 2000 scenario builds on helping delta smelt. R: Year 2000 is not part of DT charge. Concerned that we will debate 2000 options.

C: What ever we present on Monday it will be something we will build from.

C: 2000 plan is antagonistic to 2002 plan.

C: We should say something simple on Monday. Tell them what we plan to present at next meeting.

C: Need cooperation from them in going over options/assets.

S: Show them what we can do now (2000), plus options for later assets.

S: We should prioritize assets.

C: Concerned about what we can produce in 7 weeks. Can we get the 20 page report done.

C: We are looking for support for our charge and some guidance on assets.

C: We also need guidance on what direction to go.

S: We need to test assets to show what works and what doesn't.

C: Testing some of these assets does not require gaming (e.g., testing 500 cfs expansion of Banks).

Q: What is the DNCT charge? R: to get ready.